TARAXACUM PALUSTRE (Lyons) Lam. & DC., var. VULGARE (Lam.) Fernald, RHODORA **35:** 380–383. Lucille Island, BAA 370; Grand Marais, BA 34.

The Grand Marais collection we at first thought represented a distinct form because of the abundant kinky, flattened, multicellular hairs which form a lanate pubescence along the midrib, while similar but shorter hairs occurred elsewhere on the leaves. Careful field observations made upon a second visit to the locality in 1937 convinced us that it is merely a teratological response which is not constant; some plants have both very pubescent and practically glabrous leaves, while there are other individuals at this same station which are uniformly glabrous-leaved.—A reminder to unwary botanists of the pitfalls afforded by dandelions!

SONCHUS ARVENSIS L. Grand Marais, BA 758.—Roadside.

LACTUCA LUDOVICIANA (Nutt.) Riddell. Cross River, BA 929; Birch Lake, BA 826.—Cut-banks and trails.

L. BIENNIS (Moench) Fernald. Lima Mountain, BA 858; Grand Portage, BA 1019.—Trails.

PRENANTHES ALBA L. Pigeon Point, BAA 413, BAA 421; Porcupine Island, BR 6247; Long Island, AA 521; Grand Portage, Be 507; Tofte, L 4778.—Cliffs, trails, shore rocks.

HIERACIUM AURANTIACUM L. Poplar Lake, Bg (photographic record, July 1943).—Roadside. The red phase. Associated with *Ranunculus acris* and *Chrysanthemum Leucanthemum*.

H. CANADENSE Michx. Sawbill Lake, Bg 15; Birch Lake, BA 825; John Lake, BsH 246; Grand Portage, Be 652; Tofte, R 7843.—Trails, roadsides, and near human habitations.

H. UMBELLATUM L. *H. scabriusculum* Schwein. West Pike Lake, BsH 193; Pine Lake, BsH 376a, BsH 414; Clark's Bay, R 6082.—Trails and cliff-tops.

H. SCABRUM Michx. *cf.* Fernald, RHODORA **16:** 181. Alton Lake, Bg 17; Pine Lake, BsH 376, BsH 413.—Portage trails in dry open birch woods, etc.—DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA.

THE IDENTITY OF HEDYOTIS ROSEA RAF.—In the spring of 1950 and 1952 the author found growing on prairies near Stillwater, in rather localized patches, a species of *Hedyotis* (*Houstonia*) characterized by having large pink corollas (ca. 1 mm. in diameter) which are hairy in the throat, flat fruits, and spatulate basal leaves as Mueller and Mueller described *Houstonia pygmaea*.

A study of our material shows three additional characteristics that may be used for differentiating this species from our much

[1] Mueller, C. H. and Mary T. Mueller, *A New Houstonia in South-central Texas.* Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. 63: 33–34, 1936.

more common one usually referred to *H. minima.* The shape of the seeds are oblong to oblong-ovate in outline. They have a similarly shaped cavity where the seeds surround the placental attachment, this cavity being ridged, or keeled, longitudinally within (as mentioned by Gray in Syn. Fl. 1 (2): 25. 1886). The seeds are about 1 mm. long and 0.5 mm. wide; the opening is about 0.6–0.7 mm. long and 0.2–0.3 mm. wide. In *H. minima* both the seeds and the hilar cavity are circular in outline, the seeds being ca. 1.0 mm. wide, with a cavity ca. 0.3–0.4 mm. wide. The upper surface of the corolla lobes of the former species are densely clothed by minute short, flat, broad-based enations easily seen with a magnification of 30X. These are not found in *H. minima.* The stipules of *H. minima* have a triangular to lanceolate free portion about 1 mm. long, while the pink-flowered species has the joined stipules almost truncate, to rounded, to very short- and broadly-triangular at the summit.

An examination of material borrowed from the Gray Herbarium shows the pink-flowered taxon to be the same as the one Gray described as *Houstonia patens* Ell., var. *pusilla* (l. c.). It also seems the same as *Houstonia pygmaea* Mueller and Mueller, although the author has been unable to locate any type material of that species upon which the name *Hedyotis Taylorae* Fosberg, Field and Laboratory **17:** 169. 1949, is based.

In *Florula Ludoviciana:* 77, 1817, Rafinesque describes two species of *Hedyotis* as follows:

243. *Hedyotis crassifolia* Raf. Ramis tenuis divaricatis sulcatis unifloris, foliis sessilibus oblongis acutis glabris integris carnosis, floribus longe pedunculatis. Raf.—Anonyme 1. Rob. p. 454. This plant, although resembling very much the *Houstonia*, is a real Hedyotis having a capsul two celled and polysperme. It blossoms in February, it varies with white, deep violet, and pale violet flowers, stem only two inches high, tube of the corolla filiform, four stamina in the tube nearly sessile, style short, stigma oblong, capsul heart-shaped with many minute seeds.

244. *Hedyotis*? *rosea* Raf. Repens, floribus roseis.—Anonyme 2. Rob. p. 454. This may be the *Houstonia tenella* of Lyon and Pursh; Robin does not describe it, but he merely says it is still smaller than the foregoing, creeping, and with flowers of a pale rose colour.

The first species is believed by Shinners[2] to be the common

[2] Shinners, Lloyd. *Transfer of Texas Species of Houstonia to Hedyotis.* Field and Laboratory. 17: 166–169. 1949.

bluet, possibly *H. pusilla* Schoepf. 1788, non Hochst. ex. A. Rich. 1847; *H. patens* Ell., 1817, non *Hedyotis patens* Ridley, 1908.

One might question whether such an abbreviated description as Rafinesque gives for the second species can be applied with certainty to *any* species, and if not, therefore, it would be better to reject it as a *nomen dubium* in accordance with Article 63 of the International Rules. The species is not repent with us (it appears so in some well developed specimens), but the rose color of the flowers is very striking and distinctive. When in flower it may be recognized upon sight by this one characteristic. I have not seen a pink-flowered individual that has not proven to be *H. rosea*. It is almost impossible to find the species after the flowers have fallen unless their location is ascertained while they are in flower.

While we may deplore the fact that the description of Rafinesque does not contain more data (in this case it couldn't, since it was merely a translation and a formal naming of a plant described and listed as *Anonyme 2* by Robin), he *did* furnish it with a description that seems to characterize it. Can it, then, be rejected as a *nomen dubium?*

H. rosea has not been previously recorded in the Oklahoma flora. The following sheets are representative: *Trelease*, Poteau, Indian Territory (Oklahoma), Feb. 21, 1901; *Waterfall 9265*, prairie 6 miles north of Stillwater, Payne Co., March 24, 1950; *Waterfall 9267*, around buffalo-wallow in prairie, 5 miles south of Stillwater, Payne Co., March 30, 1950.

The author is indebted to the curators and the librarians of the Gray Herbarium and the Missouri Botanical Garden for the loan of specimens and the copying of descriptions.—U. T. Waterfall, Department of Botany, Oklahoma A. &. M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Angiosperm Pollen.[1]—Recent trends in taxonomy have included the utilization of more diversified data than formerly. Plant anatomy, cytology, genetics and physiology have become increasingly important areas of investigation for taxonomic purposes. These new approaches have inevitably focused attention upon minute structures of plants

[1] Pollen Morphology and Plant Taxonomy. By G. Erdtman. XII + 537 pages and 261 illustrations. The Chronica Botanica Company, Waltham, Mass. 1952. $14.00.